Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 6, 2006. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of this Application and respectfully provide these remarks. Although Applicants believe that all claims are allowable without amendment, Claims 1-7, 9-18, 20-29, and 31-34 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Applicants have also amended portions of the specification to correct clerical errors. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

The Specification as Amended Corrects the "Informalities" Raised by the Examiner

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of "informalities" on page 46, line 14 of the specification. Applicants have amended the specification to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the disclosure.

The Drawings Comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84

The Examiner objects to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84, because reference character "76" is not mentioned in the description. Applicants have amended the specification to include the identified reference. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Claims 1-5, 10-16, 21-27 and 32-34 are Allowable over *Muret*

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 10-16, 21-27 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,792,458 B1 issued to Muret, et al. (*"Muret"*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

A system for providing substantially real-time access to collected information concerning user interaction with a particular web page of a website, the system comprising:

first software associated with a particular web page of a website and operable to *collect information concerning user interaction with the particular web page*; and

second software associated with the particular web page operable to:

> *receive, from a website owner who has accessed the particular web page using a web browser while the particular web page is viewable within a browser window of the web browser, input indicating a desire to access the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page;*

> determine whether the website owner is authorized to access the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page; and

> if the website owner is authorized to access the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page:

>> generate a viewable user interface providing substantially real-time access to the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page; and

>> to provide the website owner substantially real-time access to the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page, *present the viewable user interface to the website owner in substantially real-time in response to the input received from the website owner while the particular web page was viewable within the browser window of the web browser.*

Independent Claims 12, 23, and 34 recite substantially similar limitations.

In contrast, *Muret* discloses a system 100 for monitoring and analyzing Internet traffic. (Abstract). The system operates by generating log files for each content web server 500. (Column 3, Line 64 - Column 4, Line 2). Each line of the log file 510 represents a hit or transaction by a visitor of a website on the web server 500. (Column 4, Lines 12-14). A log engine 200 processes each line of the log file and uses the information to update a database 300. (Column 4, Lines 66-67). The system 100 then allows a user to access the information in database 300. (Column 5, Lines 58-67 ("A user 530 sends a report request 540 to the report engine 400 via a web server 520. The report engine 400 obtains the data required to generate the report from the database 300, generates the report, and delivers the generated report 550 to the user 530 via the web server 520.")).

Muret distinguishes a *visitor,* that accesses and views a website, from a *user* 530, that requests a report about a website. (*Compare* Column 3, Line 67 - Column 4, Line 1 ("visitors access the web servers 500 for content") *with* Column 5, Lines 62-63 ("user 530 sends a report request 540 to the report engine 400 via a web server 520.")) *Muret* emphasizes this

distinction in Figure 1, which shows web server 500, which hosts the website accessed and viewed by the visitors, being separate from web server 520, through which user 530 sends report request 540 to system 100. *Muret* does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the visitor requests a report about the website, much less a report about a particular page of the website, that the visitor has accessed and viewed. *Muret* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the user accesses or views the website, much less a particular web page of the website, about which the user has requested a report. *Muret* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the visitor receives a report regarding the website in substantially real-time in response to accessing the website, much less receiving a report regarding a particular web page of the website in substantially real-time in response to accessing the particular web page.

Accordingly, *Muret* fails to disclose at least the following limitations recited in independent Claim 1:

- "first software associated with a particular web page of a website and operable to *collect information concerning user interaction with the particular web page*;"

- "second software associated with the particular web page operable to:"

  - *"receive, from a website owner who has accessed the particular web page using a web browser while the particular web page is viewable within a browser window of the web browser, input indicating a desire to access the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page;"* and

  - *"present the viewable user interface to the website owner in substantially real-time in response to the input received from the website owner while the particular web page was viewable within the browser window of the web browser."*

Thus, *Muret* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent Claim 1. Independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 24 are allowable for at least these reasons. Dependent Claims 2-5, 10-11, 13-16, 21-22, 24-27 and 32-33 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 12, and 23.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-5, 10-16, 21-27 and 32-34.

Claims 6-9, 17-20, and 28-31 are Allowable over the Proposed
***Muret-Kurzrok* Combination**

The Examiner rejects Claims 6-9, 17-20 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Muret* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,064 B1 issued to Kurzrok (*"Kurzrok"*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dependent Claims 6-9 depend from independent Claim 1. With respect to the elements of independent Claims 1, 12, and 23, the Examiner relies on the disclosure of *Muret* and cites to portions of *Kurzrok* as allegedly disclosing certain additional elements recited in these dependent claims. However, as shown above, *Muret* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent Claims 1, 12, and 23. Applicants respectfully submit that these inadequacies of *Muret* are not remedied by the proposed combination of *Muret* with *Kurzrok*.

Kurzrok discloses a system for collecting ratings from a reader of certain content on a web site. (Column 1, Lines 54-61). The system of *Kurzrok* compiles these ratings in a database. (Column 3, Lines 25-27). When a request for a rating summary is received, a rating for the content is calculated and the data is sent to the requester. (Column 4, Lines 23-63). *Kurzrok* does not disclose how the request for a rating summary is generated or what, if any, relationship exists between a web site "reader" and the rating summary "requester." Accordingly, *Kurzrok* necessarily does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the web site reader requests a rating summary for the content that the web site reader has read or viewed. *Kurzrok* also necessarily does not disclose that the rating summary requester read or view the content that is the subject of the rating summary.

Thus, as with *Muret, Kurzrok* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the following limitations recited in independent Claim 1:

- "first software associated with a particular web page of a website and operable to *collect information concerning user interaction with the particular web page;*"

- "second software associated with the particular web page operable to:"

- *"receive, from a website owner who has accessed the particular web page using a web browser while the particular web page is viewable within a browser window of the web browser, input indicating a desire to access the collected information concerning user interaction with the particular web page;"* and

- *"present the viewable user interface to the website owner in substantially real-time in response to the input received from the website owner while the particular web page was viewable within the browser window of the web browser."*

Therefore, even if *Muret* could properly be combined with *Kurzrok* as the Examiner proposes, which Applicants do not concede, this combination would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent Claim 1, from which dependent Claims 6-9 depend. Dependent Claims 6-9 are allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 17-20 and 28-31 are allowable for substantially similar reasons.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6-9, 17-20 and 28-31.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Christopher W. Kennerly, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6812.

Applicants believe no fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Christopher W. Kennerly
Reg. No. 40,675

Date: May 8, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

at Customer No.   **05073**